

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-25 have been amended. Support for the amendments made to claims 1-25 can be found at at least page 3, line 11 to page 5, line 4 and claims 1-25 of the application as originally filed. New claims 26-33 have been added. Support for new claims 26-33 can be found in at least claims 3, 9, and 21. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

The Office Action acknowledges the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119, but indicates that the certified copy of PCT Application No. /CN01/00732 has not been received. Applicant has submitted herewith a certified copy of PCT Application No. PCT/CN01/00732.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Application regards as the invention. Claims 4, 6-12, 16, 18-19, and 21-25 have been rejected as lacking antecedent basis. Claims 6, 8, and 12, 18, 20, and 22-25 have been rejected as being vague and/or indefinite. Claims 11-12 and 23-25 have been rejected as being in an open-ended Markush format. Applicant has amended claims 1-25 in response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 as amended are not indefinite and requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-25.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Windows 98 Explorer screendumps, 1998, Figs. 1-8 ("Explorer"). Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that "Explorer teaches a 'Views' menu for selecting one of different ways of sorting directory strings (Fig. 1)." The Office Action further asserts that "Explorer teaches the sorting of the directory strings through the selection of a menu selection such as 'List' selection (Fig. 2)." Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of "selecting one of a plurality of sort order criteria, wherein each of the plurality of sort order criteria is based on string-object information." Applicant respectfully submits that Explorer fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1.

Explorer illustrates the sorting of items in a directory by selection of a "View" menu and further selection of several viewing options including "List" and "Details." Applicant

respectfully submits that the “List” or “Details” views of Explorer are not representative of a plurality of sort order criteria. Upon the selection of a different view in Explorer, directory contents are presented in a different viewing layout, but are not sorted by different sort order criteria. Explorer further illustrates that in the “Details” view, directory contents may be sorted by name, file size, file type, and date modified. However, Applicant respectfully submits that only sorting by name as illustrated in Explorer could be said to be a sort order criteria based on string-object information. In Explorer the file size, file type, and date modified sorting options are based on characteristics of the file associated with the file name, not the string-object information of the file name itself. Applicant respectfully submits that Explorer does not teach selecting one of a plurality of sort order criteria; wherein each of the plurality of sort order criteria is based on string-object information as found in independent claim 1 as amended. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Explorer and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-12 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-12 also distinguish over Explorer and requests the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 2-12 be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 13, the Office Action asserts that Explorer teaches “a pc computer system for storing file directories and their respective names or textual strings (Fig. 1).” The Office Action further asserts that Explorer teaches “the inputting of commands to the computer using a keyboard or mouse used to select menus and directory files.” The Office Action still further asserts that Explorer discloses “sorting of the directory strings retrieved from the computer through the selection of a menu selection such as ‘List’ option, and displaying the sorted result on the display (Figs. 2-4).” Independent claim 13 has been amended to include the feature of “a sorting means for responding to a sort order criteria selected from a plurality of sort order criteria by a user, wherein each of the plurality of sort order criteria is based on string-object information, retrieving a plurality of said string objects from said storage device, and sorting the plurality of said string objects based on the selected sort order criteria of the string objects.” For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant

respectfully submits that independent claim 13 distinguishes over Explorer and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 13 be withdrawn.


Claims 14-25 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 13. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-25 also distinguish over Explorer and requests the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 14-25 be withdrawn.

New claims 26-29 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 26-29 also distinguish over Explorer. New claims 30-33 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 13. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 30-33 also distinguish over Explorer.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Michael W. Maddox  
Registration No.: 47,764  
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION  
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(214) 855-4500  
Attorneys For Applicant